

Canadian Journal of Educational Administration and Policy, Issue #34, September 20, 2004. © 2004 by CJEAP and the authors.

Athletic Gender Equity Policy in Canadian Universities: Issues and Possibilities

by [Dean Beaubier](#), University of Nebraska

Introduction

The development of gender equity policy at institutions of higher education has proven to be a difficult task. While gender equity progress is evident with the establishment of equal starting salaries for faculty at similar rank, numerous problems still exist. Valian (2004) noted, "there is greater movement of women than men into part-time positions; advancement is slower for women than for men; women earn less money than men except at entry level; women are particularly underrepresented at top-tier institutions; women receive fewer national awards and prizes" (p.208). The situation leads one to surmise: If the problems are easily identifiable then why are the solutions so elusive? Briskin (2001) asserted establishing effective equity strategy can be challenging given present postsecondary conditions. She explained:

In the current context the struggles around hierarchical organizational practices, affirmative action, curricular development and pedagogical innovation face mounting challenges. The promotion of marketization, the university-corporate nexus and private universities, combined with chronic underfunding and attacks on the mission of the academy, especially in the area of the liberal arts are endemic. These trajectories undermine collective consciousness and community and exacerbate the individualism and competitions already inherent in university culture. Further, globalization and neoliberalism are limiting access to university education, legitimizing attacks on equality-seeking by marginalized groups and reshaping the practice and meaning of citizenship (p.4).

In such an environment, one hardly should be surprised by complications elicited from attempts to craft gender equity policy for student-athletes. The development of such policy has been a painstaking process for Canadian officials at the national governing body of intercollegiate sport. Five years after a decision to update equity and equality goals initially put forth in the mid-nineties, no concrete policy has been formally accepted or implemented. However, an examination of current problems experienced by Canadian policy makers suggests there may be benefits in studying Title IX athletic legislation in American institutions of higher education. Title IX has been in place for 34 years and during this time the athletic policy has survived challenges in all three levels of U.S. government. Scrutiny of the legislation recently culminated with the U.S. Department of Education's (DOE) *Secretary's Commission on Opportunities in Athletics* - the first federal advisory panel created to study Title IX. The 15-member Commission collected information, analyzed issues, and obtained broad public input for the purpose of improving the application of current federal standards for measuring equal opportunity for individuals participating in athletics under Title IX.

The purpose of this paper is to demonstrate ways in which U.S. Title IX athletic gender equity policy could be adapted for use in Canadian higher education. In order to determine the potential to which American policy could be extrapolated and used in Canada, an examination of the Canadian development of athletic equity policy in higher education is carried out. This involves current and proposed policy initiatives by Canadian Interuniversity Sport (CIS). The paper then outlines intricacies of American Title IX athletic legislation and explains specific criticisms surrounding it. The work concludes with a rationale supporting distinct elements of Title IX policy for adaptation in Canadian universities.

The Canadian Milieu

Canadian Interuniversity Sport (CIS) is a national body that governs intercollegiate athletics, and under its auspices 11 000 student-athletes across Canada compete yearly in 11 sport disciplines with a schedule of close to 3 000 events. The CIS claims, "No other sport organization in the country can match the breadth and scope of such a program" (2004, p. 2). Because it provides a national stage for sport participation, the perception of fairness is essential in the eyes of both participants and observers. Furthermore, as an extension of Canadian academia, it is important that the organization embody the philosophies espoused by higher education. For these reasons, the development and implementation of an athletic gender equity policy is vital.

Only recently has the issue of gender equity come to the forefront in Canadian university athletics. In its June 2001 annual general assembly the CIS announced an updated policy statement concerning gender equity. It declared its acceptance of principles of equity and equality and an assurance these principles would be adhered to in all its activities. They defined equity as "treatment that is just and fair ... [and] includes gender, race, ethnicity, language, disability, income and other diversities" (p.2). They also defined equality as a situation where "all persons enjoy the same status regardless of gender, race, ethnicity, language, disability, income and other diversities. It means that all persons have equal conditions for realizing their full rights and potential and to benefit from the results" (p.2). In addition to this policy statement, the CIS put forth 12 goals at that time to achieve gender equity (see Appendix A).

While many of these goals related to actions that affected the governing body's infrastructure, the one with the most impact on student athletes pertained to athletic scholarships. The CIS, in accordance with achieving this end, had announced the previous year that the amount of financial support to male and female athletes would be proportional to the number of male and female student-athletes on their rosters by 2005-2006. In terms of establishing gender equity for athletes, the focus of the policy, financial support in proportion to actual participation, was both seemingly narrow in scope and problematic. This viewpoint was confirmed later by the CIS itself in a roundtable meeting in November 2002. The members in attendance concluded "... the current gender equity policy relating to awards was not necessarily the best way to measure or gauge the extent to which university athletics programs are implementing gender equity" (Canadian Interuniversity Sport, 2002, p.2). A number of weaknesses were put forth during this gathering. Chief amongst these were the policy did not:

- o take into account other athletic related expenditures (coaching, event presentation, traveling opportunities, uniforms, schedules, etc).
- o encourage participatory growth in situations where greater athletic opportunities were required for one gender.
- o make reference to defined sanctions for failure to comply.

After further reflection the CIS board of directors met in April 2003 and decided to develop a proposal with an expanded view towards the issue of gender equity. Thereafter, in June of that year the CIS held its annual general meeting and declared, "The provision of gender equitable participation opportunities is considered to be more important and valued in the promotion and encouragement of gender equity than simply the provision of athletic-related awards. A broader look at gender equity, of which athletic-related awards would be a part, would go further to achieving and monitoring gender equity in interuniversity athletics" (CIS, 2003, p.5). Thus, despite Canadian Interuniversity Sport's initial attempts to establish gender equity in college athletics, the organization still is working to formulate and implement a desirable policy.

U.S. Title IX Athletic Gender Equity Policy

In an attempt to establish a policy with a broader perspective towards athletic gender equity, the CIS evaluated four resources in 2004. These included its own bylaws, a 1999 CIS gender related study of university coaching/administrative positions, and the 1998 *Sport Canada Gender Equity Snap Shot* that focused on Canadian national teams. However, the fourth document was entitled *NCAA Equity in Athletics Disclosure Act*, and, unlike the aforementioned works, it outlined a gender equity evaluation tool in American intercollegiate athletics. The U.S. Equity in Athletics Disclosure Act (EADA) requires co-educational postsecondary institutions that receive federal student financial assistance, and have an intercollegiate athletic program, to prepare an annual report to the Department of Education (DOE) on athletic participation, staffing, and revenues and expenses, by men's and women's teams. The DOE uses this information in preparing its required report on gender equity in intercollegiate athletics to the U.S. Congress.

The National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) is the CIS' counterpart in American higher education and the *NCAA Equity in Athletics Disclosure Act* is a survey originating from the DOE's Office of Postsecondary Education. The survey collects athletic department data from each NCAA institution and consists of questions involving figures pertaining to: number of sports, scholarship male and female athletes, male and female coaches, coaching salaries, team revenues and expenditures, etc. Obviously, the CIS was interested in the survey because it is a tool that examines the degree of institutional athletic gender equity. This is important, but, ultimately, it is only a small part of a much larger framework in American policy. The EADA survey simply provides benchmarks that indicate the degree to which American university athletic departments are in compliance with U.S. Title IX law. Canadian policy makers would be further ahead to study Title IX itself.

Title IX is part of the United States Educational Amendments of 1972, and was designed to protect people from sex discrimination in education programs or activities receiving federal financial assistance. Title IX states "no person in the United States shall on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subject to discrimination under any educational program or activity receiving federal financial assistance" (Kaplin & Lee, 1995, p.815). While it applies to all aspects of education including postsecondary decisions involving admissions, financial assistance, housing, and harassment, it also plays a vital role in intercollegiate athletics. Initially, there was considerable debate within government as to whether such an Act applied to athletics. While this was eventually resolved, it still did not result in clear implementation. The problem for many higher education institutions was in *how* the law was to be implemented. The very nature of compliance proved to be problematic. On July 21, 1975, the federal government's Regulation (34 C.F.R. Part 106) governing the application of Title IX to athletic programs became effective. The Regulation was divided into two main categories: those that dealt with athletic scholarships and those that provided guidance regarding athletics in general.

Despite the fact that Congress passed Title IX over 30 years ago, in terms of achieving its purpose the policy presently cannot be deemed an unqualified success. Undoubtedly, the legislation has enabled women to make significant progress with regard to increasing their opportunities in intercollegiate athletics. The National Women's Law Centre (NWLC) (2002) noted that in 1972 females received only 2% of school's athletic budgets and athletic scholarships for women were nonexistent. This has changed dramatically so that today "the number of college women participating in competitive athletics is nearly five times the pre-Title IX rate" (p.2). However, women have yet to achieve parity with men in college sports. They make up over half of the undergraduates at universities, but female athletes only account for 42% of college varsity athletes nationwide. In fact, female participation in intercollegiate athletics remains below pre-Title IX male

participation rates. Furthermore, "women in Division I colleges, while representing 41% of the athletes, receive only 32% of recruiting dollars and 36% of operating dollars" (NWLC, 2002, p.2). Such statistics reveal that the athletic Regulation of 1975 has had an effective but limited impact on gender equity in university athletics.

As mentioned, the Regulation also specifically addresses equity as it pertains to athletic scholarships. This failure of the policy also is noted by the findings of the National Women's Law Center (2002). They stated:

in 2000, male athletes received the access and opportunities that athletic scholarships provide nearly one and a half times as often as their female counterparts. The difference amounted to \$133 million dollars more per year in athletic scholarships for male athletes than female athletes. In fact, on the 30th anniversary of Title IX, the National Women's Law Center identified 30 of the hundreds of colleges and universities that remain out of compliance with Title IX requirements for fair allocation of athletic scholarships, and is taking steps to secure these schools' prompt remedy of their scholarship inequalities (p.9).

To summarize, the effectiveness of the Regulation comes into question with the NWLC's (2002) pronouncement that the playing field for female athletes is far from level when one considers the limited opportunities to participate, fewer scholarship dollars, and the inferior athletic equipment and facilities.

The debate over Title IX has been intense and, as discussed, practically began with its inception. However, the deliberation may have come to some sense of finality. On July 11, 2003 the DOE's Office for Civil Rights (OCR) issued a Clarification Letter that outlined the federal government's position towards intercollegiate athletics policy regarding Title IX compliance. In the aftermath of the *Commission on Opportunity in Athletics*, the letter was much awaited by both advocates and opponents of the policy. Thirty years since the introduction of the statute, numerous problems had been documented with relation to it and these were discussed and evaluated by the Commission for eight months. At the end of that period, the Commission made 23 key recommendations, 15 of which were approved by unanimous consent. With this information in hand, the Bush administration sought to ameliorate the policy and effectively eliminate the limitations evident in Title IX. However, the resulting Clarification Letter revealed that the government generally accepted the policy status quo.

The Commission had made proposals that stood to potentially alter the policy in a drastic, and some contend 'damaging', fashion. These included adoption of a "reasonable variance" standard for evaluating substantial proportionality, greater use of interest surveys and youth participation data to determine the proper allocation of playing opportunities between the sexes, and an open invitation to vary, amend, or eliminate the three-prong test for compliance. The Clarification Letter rejected each of these and instead suggested minor changes Grossman (2003) described as "subtle" and which "do not represent much, if any, change..." (p.4). She stated, "In the end, the yearlong effort by the Commission to see whether the most successful civil rights statute in history needed to be 'fixed' was a waste of taxpayer time and money. That money would certainly have been better spent enforcing Title IX, rather than trying to undercut it" (p.5).

While some may agree with Grossman's assessment of the Commission's relevance, advocates of the policy probably should be grateful for the government's attempt to deal with Title IX's limitations. Nancy Hogshead-Makar is a former Olympic gold medalist in swimming and a current professor at Florida Coastal School of Law. She spoke with trepidation to the issue of finality. She believed that "Title IX has always been a political football, and it will probably continue to be so. Opponents of the law will not disappear" (personal communication, October 24, 2003). Nevertheless, she wrote the Commission and subsequent Clarification Letter provided the third avenue of closure to the debate encompassing the policy. Hogshead-Makar (2003) noted at this junction in time, opponents "have lost in all three branches of government." Their efforts have failed in the legislature, in the judiciary, and now in the executive branch. This is important to realize in any discussion that profiles the limitations with Title IX.

Potential Adaptation of Title IX

Any adoption of Title IX policy at Canadian institutions might take the form of a partial exercise rather than an implementation in its entirety. There are two important reasons for this. First, unlike gender equity policy at American universities and colleges, policy implemented in Canada will not have the force of law. A criticism of Title IX in American schools has been its limited effect due to enforcement problems. This does not bode well for Canadian policy, as its enforcement will be left entirely to the individual schools and the CIS itself. At this point in time, the degree of accountability, enforcement, and potential punishment involving any implemented policy is questionable. Secondly, finance is another issue that may dissuade Canadian administrators from pursuing a total adoption of the U.S. policy. In the American decision handed down in *Cohen v. Brown*, the Court ruled that budgetary constraints were not a defence for non-compliance with Title IX requirements. This is problematic because one means of Title IX compliance requires institutions to have a history and continuing practice of expanding opportunities for women. The problem with achieving this goal within a restrictive financial environment has been noted by a number of scholars who have studied the details of Title IX policy. For example, Starace (2001) argued if expansion continued more spending would have to occur in most women's programs and it would be difficult to meet this prong of the regulation because athletic departments already have little to spend. Davidson and Kerr (1995) asserted, "as university spending decreases, athletic programs will have difficulty complying with Title IX" (p.14). The implications for Canadian universities suggest the CIS may not wish to undertake a similar policy initiative. Athletics in Canadian higher education do not involve the large budgets or yield the fiscal profits many American institutions are capable of generating. As such, the schools themselves cannot count on monetary profits from their respective sports as a means of financing athletic programs. Furthermore, the present financial situation on a number of

Canadian campuses probably prevents general expenditures from being directed towards an extensive enhancement of athletic programs. Faculty renewal and improvements to the physical plant likely take precedent.

The American experience instead suggests there are a number of areas that Canadian higher education could benefit from in terms of policy adaptation. One might argue the first of these is the definition of gender equity itself. Canadian officials realized the need for an appropriate definition, but the result, in fact, may have been partially responsible for the slow development and implementation of effective policy. The CIS initially chose to construct their policy with a conceptual framework that tied equity with equality. As noted, they defined equity as "treatment that is just and fair" while they defined equality as a situation where "all persons have equal conditions for realizing their full rights and potential and to benefit from the results" (CIS, 2001, p.2). What was missing from both of these perspectives is the idea of 'participation' that underlies the policy framework of Title IX legislation. This is important. Actions that address just and fair treatment of athletes or promote equal conditions do not necessarily encourage, promote, or dictate the existence of gender equity in terms of opportunity within athletic programs. This conceptual exclusion is problematic and proof of this lies in the CIS' acknowledgement of shortfalls in its athletic scholarship policy. A re-examination of the definition with some adaptation of the American meaning would enable the CIS to construct an array of directives to better address the concerns voiced in November 2002.

Title IX legislation also provides some measure by which Canadian policymakers could deal with the problem of limited opportunities for women in higher education athletics. CIS members had expressed the concern that policy should be constructed to allow the opportunity for growth, especially where limits are characterized by ranges or percentages. Title IX stimulates this growth through the three-part test of the 1979 Interpretation. According to the test, universities have three options by which to demonstrate compliance with the law, as follows:

1. have the same proportion of women on sports teams as there are female undergraduates;
2. have a history and continuing practice of expanding opportunities for women; or
3. prove that they are fully and effectively accommodating the interests and abilities of women on the campus and among the institution's potential students.

A third area of Title IX to which Canadian policymakers should pay heed deals not with the policy itself but with its enforcement. Opponents of Title IX criticize its ineffectiveness and question why the Regulation is so limited in results when such considerable effort has been undertaken to develop it for athletic Title IX compliance. Passeggi (2002) argued the Office for Civil Rights (OCR) Title IX enforcement has proven largely ineffective for one specific reason – a lack of resources to initiate investigations into when universities have failed to comply. She maintained that proof of noncompliance has therefore become dependent upon complaints. Thus, while the OCR has the power to suspend all federal funding to a university that fails to comply with Title IX, it has yet to undertake such action at any institution during its thirty-year history. This is somewhat ironic in light of the fact the American judicial system has settled numerous Title IX litigations in favour of plaintiffs against universities. The CIS should keep this in mind in determining the best way to enforce its own policy. Unlike its American counterpart, the NCAA, the CIS will be the author of its own gender equity policy and cannot expect or rely upon intervention by government legislative and judicial bodies in its enforcement. Surely, the same criticisms suggesting ineffectiveness will exist if the CIS does not fully develop methods and means of enforcing the gender equity policy it eventually implements.

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, Title IX can provide policy guidance regarding appropriate areas of compliance to Canadian institutions of higher education (see Table 1). One major criticism of the CIS' early policy initiative was it focused only on athletic awards and did not consider other athletic related expenditures such as coaching, event presentation, traveling opportunities, uniforms, and schedules (CIS, 2002). While the Title IX statute clearly outlines the purpose and intent of the Act, it is the Regulations and the Policy Interpretation documents that delineate the areas and provide the means by which institutions of higher education can comply with the law.

As previously discussed, the Regulation of 1975 was divided into two main parts, those that dealt with athletic scholarships and those that provided guidance regarding athletics in general. In total the document provided institutions with 11 program areas to be reviewed for compliance. Two other areas of compliance were added to these as a result of the OCR's analysis of institutional difficulties regarding implementation. These two areas appeared in the 1979 Policy Interpretation as support services and recruitment of student athletes. Table 1 outlines the areas and means by which institutions can comply with the various areas that Title IX examines in university and college athletic programs.

Table 1

Areas and Means of Compliance

Area of Compliance	Means of Compliance
34 C.F.R. 106.37(c) 1. Athletic Scholarship	Scholarship dollars to be awarded to women and men at same proportion as their respective rate of participation in the intercollegiate

	athletics program
34 C.F.R. 106.41(c) 2. Accommodation of Interests and Abilities	Participation proportionate to undergraduate enrolment; or, history and continuing practice of program expansion for underrepresented sex; or, fully and effectively accommodate underrepresented sex; equivalent levels of competition
3. Equipment and Supplies	Quality; amount; suitability; maintenance and replacement; availability of equipment and supplies
4. Scheduling of Games and Practice Time	Number of games; number, length, and time of day of practices; time of day of games; pre-season and post-season opportunities
5. Travel and Per Diem Allowance	Modes of transportation; housing furnished during travel; length of stay before and after competitive events; dining arrangements and per diem
6. Tutors	Availability – procedures and criteria for obtaining assistance; Assistance – qualifications, training, experience, etc.; Compensation – rate of pay, pupil loads, qualifications, experience, other terms and conditions of employment
7. Coaches	Availability – full time, part time, assistant, and graduate assistants; Assignment – training, experience, professional standing, and other professional qualifications; Compensation – rate of compensation, duration of contracts, conditions relating to contract renewal, experience, nature of coaching duties, working conditions, and other terms and conditions of employment
8. Locker Rooms, Practice and Competitive Facilities	Quality, availability, and exclusivity of practice and competitive facilities; quality and availability of locker rooms; maintenance and preparation of practice and competitive facilities
9. Medical and Training Facilities and Services	Availability of medical personnel; availability and quality of weight, training, and conditioning facilities; availability and qualifications of athletics trainers; health, accident, and injury insurance coverage
10. Housing and Dining Facilities and Services	Housing provided; special services as part of housing; dining arrangements
11. Publicity	Availability and quality of sports information personnel; access to other publicity resources; quantity and quality of publications and other promotional devices
12. Support Services	Administrative, secretarial, and clerical support: office space
13. Recruitment of Student Athletes	Equal opportunities for professional personnel

to recruit; availability of financial and other resources for recruitment; equivalent benefits, opportunities, and treatment of prospective athletes
--

Presently, Canadian Interuniversity Sport has decided the 2005-06 academic year will be the target date for implementation of its gender equity policy. The argument for adapting Title IX directives appears strong as the CIS moves through its policy development process. Recognition of Title IX influences has never been made in CIS policy documents, but recent actions by the governing body suggest it is either aware of Title IX initiatives or the organization unknowingly is developing guidelines that parallel U.S. legislation. Regardless of the contexts, linkage with American athletic gender equity policy is growingly evident. This was clear when the CIS proposed a new definition for 'gender equity' at its directors' meeting in April 2004. The meeting's working document defined the term as follows: "gender equity is the principle and practice of fair and equitable allocation of opportunity and resources to both females and males. Gender equity eliminates practices that are barriers to full participation of either gender" (CIS, 2004b, p.42). For the first time since Canadian Interuniversity Sport's decision to revise its policy, the organization noted on paper the importance of both 'participation' and 'opportunity' as concepts within the framework of gender equity. As discussed earlier in this paper, these ideas are analogous precepts to Title IX.

At the same directors' meeting, a new focus for examining gender equity was announced. The proposal went beyond the original strategy of connecting equity only to athletic scholarships and instead outlined four indicators to determine opportunities and resources for each gender. These four areas included athletic participation, financial awards, coaching/leadership, and operating expenses. This act of broadening the indicators again reflects Title IX policy whereby institutional compliance with the Act is not based solely upon one factor but instead examines athletic programs as a whole.

A significant recognition of Title IX influence on CIS policymakers was also noticeable in the organization's stance towards athletic participation opportunities. The 2004 directors' meeting concluded that participation opportunities would be used as a benchmark to measure equity. The board's working document stated, "The first benchmark would have Athletic Participation Opportunities linked to each member institutions full-time equivalency of the student population. Undergraduate & graduate would both be used in the calculation of student population. For example, an institution that had a student population of 70% women and 30% men would need to provide more opportunities for women" (CIS, 2004b, p.42). Although this means of compliance included graduate student population and also recommended, "institutions athletic participation opportunities should be within a 10% degree of their student population" (p.42), the concept is similar to the proportionality prong that is one of the main components of Title IX's three-part test.

Canadian Interuniversity Sport's movement towards developing an equity policy similar to American legislation is encouraging in many respects. However, further study of Title IX's intricacies is still highly recommended before September 2005. A case in point would be the recent debate over 'nontraditional' students in the proportionality requirement of Title IX's three-part test. Recommendation 20 of the *Secretary's Commission on Opportunities in Athletics* stated, "In demonstrating compliance with the proportionality requirement of the first part of the three-part test, the male/female ratio of athletic participation should be measured against the male/female ratio of an institution's undergraduate population minus nontraditional students" (U.S. Department of Education, 2003, p.39). For the purposes of Title IX, 'nontraditional' students were defined as those who are not between the ages of 18 and 24 and those of any age who have children.

This recommendation met with considerable opposition and was never implemented in the aftermath of the Commission's report. However, the argument over its potential impact does have implications for Canadian university athletics. In their published dissent of the report, commissioners de Varona and Foudy (2003) noted, "among individuals older than 24 who were enrolled in [American] degree-granting institutions in 2001, women outnumbered men by 37%" (p.14). The exclusion or inclusion of such individuals may possibly affect the percentages in any calculation of gender proportion at an institution. For American policymakers, though, the effect would be minor in comparison to Canadian universities. If the proportion of one gender is skewed by age, the Canadian decision to include graduate students in their benchmark of 'Athletic Participation Opportunities' may have unintended consequences related to their policy. In reviewing American policy, the CIS may want to re-evaluate its own directive.

Conclusion

Green (1994) maintained the formation of policy largely is dependent upon crafting a response to a problem for which there is no, and perhaps never will be, clear direct solution. The author explained the situation surrounding the conceptual framework of policy in terms of policy 'questions' and 'answers.' He defined a policy question as "a request for a fairly stable, but modifiable, line of action aimed at securing an optimal adjustment of the conflict between different goods, all of which must be pursued, but which, taken together, cannot be maximized" (p.2). Thus, he suggests there is no technical solution to any policy question but the answer instead is always a line of action, a specification of what to do.

The situation surrounding gender equity in Canadian university athletics demonstrates the elusive qualities impacting a policy question and the challenges faced in the development of an answer. To remedy the circumstances requires a process

that includes identification of areas where policy is needed, analysis of existing policy, and policy formulation. While the CIS formulates a policy platform, analysis of existing Title IX policy at American universities can contribute to the enhancement of the 'answer' for Canadian institutions of higher education.

Not only will greater study provide Canadian policymakers with additional insights in mapping their own athletic directions for the future, it will enable the CIS to examine legislation that encompasses all facets of higher education. This is important because university athletic policy should be aligned to recognize the guiding principles of the institutions themselves. The NCAA's 1993 *Gender-Equity Task Force Report* concluded, "An athletics program can be considered gender equitable when the participants in both the men's and women's sports programs would accept as fair and equitable the overall program of the other gender" (p.2). This end product would be acceptable to student-athletes, but policymakers in higher education must realize this is an objective and not the rationale for establishing gender equity in athletics. Policy should demonstrate to the underrepresented gender that they have a future in academia and the professions. It should also provide access to resources that maximize the number of people who will receive the necessary power to do their best work. And it should create a stronger institution through a reputation for fairness while improving students' experiences and job opportunities (Valian, 2004).

Bailyn (2003) warned, "analyses of gender in the academy ... and suggested improvements, have been available for decades (e.g. Acker, 1983; Aisenberg and Harrington, 1988; Bernard, 1964; Bug, 2000; DeSole and Butler, 1990; Keller, 1992; Kemelgor and Etzkowitz, 2001; J.R. Martin, 2000) but have had little fundamental impact on universities and their procedures" (p. 138). Canadian athletic administrators must avoid this pattern of ineffective outcomes and strive to develop and implement a policy that will provide positive consequences for student-athletes. The study of American efforts can only enhance the end result.

References

- Bailyn, L. (2003). Academic careers and gender equity: Lessons learned from MIT. *Gender, work and organization*, 10(2), 137-154.
- Briskin, L. (2001, December). Crafting an effective equity strategy. *Caut Bulletin*. Retrieved August 7, 2004, from <http://www.caut.ca/english/bulletin/2001_dec/commentary/equity.asp>
- Canadian Interuniversity Sport. (2001). *Policies and procedures*. Retrieved August 8, 2004, from <http://cisport.ca/Policies_Procedures/90_Conduct%20and%20Enforcement.htm>
- Canadian Interuniversity Sport. (2002). *Notes from the CIS members' roundtable – draft #2*. Retrieved February 11, 2004 from <http://www.cisport.ca/enews/02_Roundtable/Final_report_02_rountable_2.htm>
- Canadian Interuniversity Sport. (2003). April 2003 board of directors meeting minutes. Retrieved July 24, 2004, from <http://www.cisport.ca/enews/April03/April_03_BOD_Meeting_Minutes.htm>
- Canadian Interuniversity Sport. (2004). *Programs and services*. Retrieved August 8, 2004, from <<http://www.universitysport.ca/e/about/index.htm>>
- Canadian Interuniversity Sport. (2004b). *Board of directors meeting April 14-15*. Retrieved August 8, 2004, from <http://www.universitysport.ca/e/meetings/documents/Apr.04BODMeetingMinutes_000.pdf>
- Davidson, G. A., & Kerr, C. A. (1995). Title IX: What is gender equity. *Villanova sports and entertainment law journal*, 2(1). Retrieved February 26, 2004 from <http://vls.law.vill.edu/students/orgs/sports/back_issues/volume2/issue1/titleix.html>
- De Varona, D., & Foudy, J. (2003). Minority views on the report of the commission on opportunity in athletics. Retrieved August 12, 2004, from <<http://www.savetitleix.com/minorityreport.pdf>>
- Green, T. F. (1994). Policy questions: A conceptual study. *Education policy analysis archives*, 2(7). Retrieved February 18, 2004, from <<http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v2n7.html>>
- Grossman, J. (2003). *Saving title IX: Recent developments spell good news for the federal statute prohibiting sex discrimination in high school and college athletics*. Retrieved February 16, 2004 from <<http://writ.news.findlaw.com/grossman/20030715.html>>
- Kaplin, W. A., & Lee, B. A. (1995). *The law of higher education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- National Women's Law Center. (2002). *The battle for gender equity in athletics: Title IX at thirty*. Retrieved February 12, 2004 from <[http://www.nwlc.org/pdf/Battle for Gender Equity in Athletics Report.pdf](http://www.nwlc.org/pdf/Battle%20for%20Gender%20Equity%20in%20Athletics%20Report.pdf)>
- NCAA. (1993). *Final report of the NCAA gender-equity task force*. Retrieved August 7, 2004, from

<http://www.ncaa.org/gender_equity/resource_materials/Historical/Task_Force_Report.pdf>

Passeggi, T. (2002). *Title IX and gender equity in intercollegiate athletics: Is it time for a change?* Retrieved February 16, 2004 from

<www.law.uoregon.edu/faculty/cforell/titleix.pdf>

Starace, M. K. (2001). Reverse discrimination under title ix: Do men have a sporting chance? *Villanova sports and entertainment law journal*, 8(1). Retrieved February 26, 2004 from

<http://vls.law.vill.edu/students/orgs/sports/back_issues/volume8/issue1/sporting.html>

U.S. Department of Education. (2003). *Open to all: Title IX at Thirty. The Secretary's Commission for Opportunity in Athletics*. Retrieved August 8, 2004, from <<http://www.ed.gov/about/bdscomm/list/athletics/title9report.pdf>>

Valian, V. (2004). Beyond gender schemas: Improving the advancement of women in academia. *NWSA (national women's studies association) Journal*, 16(1), 207-221.

Appendix A

1. That Canadian Interuniversity Sport be sensitive to and seek out opportunities for gender balance when identifying members for committees to reach an objective of no less than 40% representation of one gender.
2. That Canadian Interuniversity Sport increase the marketability and profile of women's programs and ensure financial resources are available for this purpose.
3. That Canadian Interuniversity Sport ensure there is gender and geographical balance in the ratio of support personnel to match the athlete participation ratio for Canadian Interuniversity Sport sanctioned international events.
4. That Canadian Interuniversity Sport promote member institutions to assume a leadership role in their local and regional communities to encourage young women to pursue sport as a career option.
5. That Canadian Interuniversity Sport continue to participate in and lead the development and perpetuation of women in coaching initiatives at the post-secondary level.
6. That Canadian Interuniversity Sport use equity as a basic principle when considering developing any type of partnerships with other agencies or organizations.
7. That Canadian Interuniversity Sport ensure all persons are portrayed in an equitable way in all promotional materials and communications.
8. That Canadian Interuniversity Sport safeguard the rights of its members and its employees to equal treatment without unlawful discrimination or harassment.
9. That Canadian Interuniversity Sport promote gender equity in the implementation of Canadian Interuniversity Sports awards policy.
10. That Canadian Interuniversity Sport maintain a balance in the competitive opportunities available to both genders at the national level.
11. That Canadian Interuniversity Sport ensure that the bilingualism policy is adhered to at all events, functions, and meetings and in all publications.
12. That Canadian Interuniversity Sport be sensitive to cultural diversity when scheduling all events, functions and meetings (p.2).